			1
1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS		
2	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS FORT WORTH DIVISION		
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA		
4	v.	. 4:09-CR-172-A	
5	NGOZI NNAJI	. Fort Worth, Texas	
6	EMMANUEL NNAJI	. June 4, 2010	
7	EDANGEDIDE OF DECEMBERING		
8	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS (Sentencing Hearing)		
9	BEFORE THE HONORABLE JOHN MCBRYDE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE		
10			
11	APPEARANCES:		
12	For the Government:	MS. SUSAN L. FRENCH	
13		MR. MICHAEL J. FRANK U.S. Department of Justice	
14		601 D Street NW, Room 5132 Washington, DC 20530 (214) 514-3104	
15			
16	For Defendant N. Nnaji:	MR. REED W. PROSPERE Prospere, Russell & Dean 8111 Preston Road, Suite 500	
17		Dallas, Texas 75225 (214) 750-8555	
18	For Defendant E. Nnaji:	MS. MARLO P. CADEDDU	
19	FOI Defendant E. Miaji.	Attorney at Law 3232 McKinney Avenue, Suite 70	ın
20		Dallas, Texas 75204 (214) 220-9000	U
21	Count Double of		
22	Court Reporter:	MS. ANA P. WARREN U.S. District Court Reporter 501 W. 10th Street, Room 201	
23		Fort Worth, Texas 76102-3637 (817) 850-6681	
24	Drogoodings resembled by week-		
25	Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography; transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.		

```
2
 1
                             PROCEEDINGS
 2
          (Commencing, 9:30 a.m.)
 3
               THE COURT: I'm next calling for sentencing Number --
 4
      actually, it's two defendants in this case. It's Number
 5
      4:09-CR-172-A. It's United States of America versus -- I'm
 6
      having a hard time pronouncing these names. I think it's
 7
      Nnaji --
 8
               MR. PROSPERE: Ngozi Nnaji and Emmanuel Nnaji.
 9
               THE COURT: Okay. And the other defendant is
10
      Emmanuel Nnaji?
11
               MS. CADEDDU: Yes, Your Honor.
12
               THE COURT: And Ms. French and Mr. Frank are here for
13
      the government.
14
               MS. FRENCH: Yes, Your Honor.
               THE COURT: And Mr. Prospere is here for --
15
16
               MR. PROSPERE: Ngozi.
17
               THE COURT: Ngozi.
18
          And Mr. Westfall?
19
               MS. CADEDDU: No, You Honor. You gave Mr. Westfall
20
      permission to delegate to me today, Marlo Cadeddu, for Mr.
21
      Ngozi -- Mr. Nnaji. I'm sorry.
22
               THE COURT: Marlo Cadeddu?
               MS. CADEDDU: Cadeddu, Yes, Your Honor.
23
               THE COURT: Cadeddu is here for Emmanuel Nnaji.
24
25
          Ms. Nnaji, state your name for the record.
```

guilty of Count 6 of the indictment, which charged false

25

perhaps, your client should receive a two-level increase.

25

It's 2A3.1(B)(4)(b), based on the fact that the victim received serious bodily injury. The probation officer didn't give that increase, and I've discussed that with the probation officer, and the probation officer was uncertain as to whether the record would support a finding that your client should have foreseen that, which I gather to be relevant conduct, that it would have to be something -- apparently, there was no question that the events occurred, the sexual assaults occurred, and there is no question that it was related to the offenses of conviction, but I gather to be relevant conduct that would be chargeable against your client. It would have to be something that she could have reasonably foreseen would happen or knew was happening.

It occurred to me, in fact, that she should have foreseen it. It's happening right there in the house. At least some of the sexual harassment is happening right there in the house. I'm not sure -- some serious things were happening right there in the house where your client was situated, Mr. Prospere.

Let me ask the government's attorney what they think.

They didn't object to the presentence report because of the failure of the probation officer to give that two-level increase. So maybe the government agrees that it shouldn't be given. What is the government's position, Ms. French?

MS. FRENCH: Judge, the government didn't disagree.

I think the evidence at trial was the victim testified on direct that there was an incident when Emmanuel Nnaji came into her bedroom at night when she had the children in bed with her, and he groped and fondled her, and she cried out, and it drew the attention of the female defendant, Ngozi. I don't know if this was part of the testimony at trial, but it was in the 302s that were supplied to probation, that she was made to apologize the next day to Ngozi for waking her up that night.

I think, in addition, the evidence is that the -- Ngozi and Emmanuel Nnaji worked different shifts and that there was a second incident that she testified -- and I say that because she was aware that Emmanuel was alone with Cecilia, the victim, for extended periods of time.

I also don't know if this was actually part of the testimony, but I know it's in the FBI reports of interview, that at the time the Nnaji's moved to the second house, that Emmanuel Nnaji had all of the locks -- had locks put on all the bedroom doors except the bedroom where Cecilia slept with the children, and in the 302, the report of interview, says that his statement to the victim was that he wanted easy access to her children, but, in fact, she begged him to put the lock on the door so she could protect herself.

Even if there wasn't direct evidence at trial that Ngozi Nnaji knew that the rapes were occurring, she could certainly

infer from the conduct of him coming in her bedroom at nighttime and fondling her, and, in fact, the only room that did not have a lock on the door was Cecilia's.

There was a further incident after Michael was born that she testified about at trial when Emmanuel took Cecilia to buy a goat to cook as a celebration dinner --

THE COURT: I remember the details of that.

MS. FRENCH: Right. And they came back late, and there was, apparently, an incident, and, apparently, Emmanuel did not very well explain the extended absence. The victim explained what happened during that time.

THE COURT: Well, I think the issue is, can the Court find from a preponderance of the evidence based on the facts you've related, some of which are not related in the presentence report, that she reasonably should have known. I think -- let me see.

MS. FRENCH: I believe the evidence that is before the Court from the trial that was before the jury is the testimony of the victim about the incident at nighttime when Emmanuel came into her room and fondled her, and she screamed out and drew the attention of Ngozi. That is what I think the evidence is before the Court.

THE COURT: Well, are you telling me that the government thinks that the evidence would support the inference that she knew or should have known that the --

```
8
               MS. FRENCH: I think the evidence --
 1
 2
               THE COURT: -- attacks were going to occur?
 3
               MS. FRENCH: Yes.
 4
               THE COURT: Okay. Let me hear from you,
 5
      Mr. Prospere.
 6
               MR. PROSPERE: Judge, there is a statement in the
 7
      302 -- and Ms. Baker is here to speak to this -- that
 8
      indicates that there was no evidence that Ngozi Nnaji ever had
 9
      any knowledge of these sexual activities between Emmanuel and
10
      Cecilia.
11
               THE COURT: Well, it's more than just knowledge.
12
      It's -- should she have foreseen?
13
               MR. PROSPERE: Well, I don't think that she should --
14
               THE COURT: Let me see what you're talking about. Do
15
      you happen to have that?
16
               MR. PROSPERE: I do not have that copy.
17
               THE COURT: Do you happen to have one, Ms. French?
      He says there was one that says that she had no knowledge of
18
      any of the sexual --
19
20
               MS. FRENCH: No, sir. I don't know if that is in
21
      reference to her own statement to the FBI agent.
22
          Is that what you're referring to?
23
               MR. PROSPERE: No. It's a statement contained within
24
      the 302s, the FBI's conclusion about -- at least what I
25
      interpret it being the FBI's conclusion after looking into
```

MS. FRENCH: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: What is your name? You were identified during the trial. What is your name?

MS. BAKER: Jennifer Baker.

THE COURT: Okay. You heard what Mr. Prospere said about one of your reports.

Are you talking about one of her reports?

MR. PROSPERE: Judge, I believe it is. I believe it is. There were two agents. She took over, I think I'm correct, from another agent, but my clear recollection is that there is a statement in the 302s to the effect that my client had no knowledge of the sexual activities on the part of her husband. Now, whether she wrote the 302 or it was a 302 that was written that she adopted subsequently, I don't know.

THE COURT: Are you aware of any such statement in any of the 302s?

MS. BAKER: There is no such statement, but I believe what he may be thinking of is I made an agent note, which was, when I asked her, if I recall, had she been aware of any -- I don't know how I put the question, but had she been aware of Emmanuel mistreating Cecilia, and at that point she broke down and started crying and gave me the comments that I have the best husband in the world. All my co-workers say he's such a great husband, and I made the note at this point in the interview Ngozi Nnaji began to cry and gave the explanation

that her husband is a great husband. That may be what he's thinking about.

THE COURT: Is that the closest you can think of that's in any of the 302s?

MS. BAKER: Correct.

2.0

THE COURT: That it would be something he might have in mind?

MS. BAKER: Yes, because in the 302s, I do not make personal opinions. If there is an observation, I include that as an agent note, and I made the observation, but it's not a personal opinion, sir.

THE COURT: Well, it's a close question.

I'll tell you what. Since it's not in the presentence report, and, apparently, some of the information I've had to rely on, if I found from a preponderance of the evidence that she should have known about it or did know about it, is not recited in the presentence report.

I think you told me about things, Ms. French, that are in those 302s that aren't in the presentence report. Am I correct?

MS. FRENCH: That is correct, sir, yes.

THE COURT: And I don't think I can make findings at this time without Mr. Prospere having advance notice of what I'm relying on or his client having advanced notice. So I'm not going to have that increase based on the sexual conduct.

```
13
      So you can take that out of consideration.
 1
 2
               MR. PROSPERE: Yes, sir.
 3
               THE COURT: Though, I really think it probably should
 4
      be given, but I'm not.
 5
          Okay. So let me go to -- I think both defendants have
 6
      objected to the two-level increase based on obstruction of
 7
      justice. So we're going to deal with that together.
 8
          So why don't you step aside just a minute, Mr. Prospere,
 9
      with your client, and I'll have Mr. Nnaji come to the
10
      microphone with his attorney, and I'll ask him a few questions
11
      before we get to him and that objection.
12
          Mr. Nnaji, you appeared before me -- well, I've already
      gone through this about what the jury found you guilty of and
13
14
      that we're here today for sentencing based on those things.
          Ms. Cadeddu, did you and your client receive in a timely
15
16
      manner the presentence report and the addenda to it?
17
               MS. CADEDDU: Yes, Your Honor, we did.
               THE COURT: And did both of you read those items and
18
      then discuss them with each other?
19
20
               MS. CADEDDU: Yes, sir, we did.
21
               THE COURT: I'm assuming that you were the one
22
      involved in doing those things. Is that a safe assumption?
23
               MS. CADEDDU: Yes, Your Honor, that is correct.
```

Mr. Westfall was also involved, but, yes, I was.

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
15
offer is attached to the objection itself, which is the
e-mailed fax, I think, that was sent in response to the
government's making us aware of the fact that this was at
issue. It's attached to the objection that was filed in
regards to this matter.
        MS. CADEDDU: Yes, sir. I would concur, Your Honor,
with that, Your Honor. I have no additional evidence in
addition to that.
         THE COURT: Let me see what you're talking about.
   By the way, I notice that one of the documents -- I think
it was in Mr. Nnaji's case -- referred to the people who
contacted the victim's family as his relatives or his
brothers, and I think it's clear that they were hers. Does
everybody agree with that?
        MS. CADEDDU: Thank you, Your Honor, yes.
         THE COURT: Well, for some reason or other, I can't
find the --
         MS. CADEDDU: Your Honor, I believe the e-mail is
attached to -- I know it's attached to Mr. Nnaji's objections
to the presentence report.
         THE COURT: Okay. I'm looking at hers. Let's see.
   Are you talking about Exhibit A to your objections,
Mr. Prospere?
        MR. PROSPERE: Sir, I'm sorry?
         THE COURT: Are you talking about Exhibit A to your
```

```
16
 1
      objections?
 2
               MR. PROSPERE: Yes, sir.
 3
               THE COURT: Is that the e-mail you're talking about,
      the fax or whatever?
 4
 5
               MR. PROSPERE: Yes, sir.
               THE COURT: It says, "Dear Fidelis (phonetic), this
 6
 7
      is my e-mail address -- and it gives an e-mail address -- for
 8
      fax messages --
 9
               MR. PROSPERE: It actually would be the next page, is
10
      the e-mail that we sent.
11
               THE COURT: Okay. The next page is what your client
12
      sent to her sister?
13
               MR. PROSPERE: To her brother.
14
               THE COURT: To her brother.
          (Brief pause in proceedings)
15
16
               THE COURT: Let me ask you this, Ms. French. What do
17
      you think there is in the presentence report factually that
      would support a finding that either of these defendants knew
18
      that the threatening conduct was being engaged in?
19
20
               MS. FRENCH: I quess Page 11, sir. I'm now looking
21
      at the presentence report, Pages 11 and 12.
22
               THE COURT: Pages 11 and 12?
23
               MS. FRENCH: There is a brief factual recitation, and
2.4
      then in the addendum --
25
               THE COURT: Well, all I recall seeing was that
```

create false documents, and that the female defendant's family members were the conduit in Nigeria for both the male and female defendant throughout the eight-year scheme. That was how it worked. In other words, when there were communications with the victim's family in Nigeria, it always involved the female defendant. So I think it's reasonably foreseeable that the male defendant knew what was going on in Nigeria.

The only people that interest was served whatsoever by the intimidation of trying to keep this information from becoming public were, in fact, both defendants and that it had been part of the scheme for eight years that he felt defendant's families were -- family members of Nigeria were communicators to the victim's family members.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Prospere, did you want to make some statement on this subject?

MR. PROSPERE: Well, Judge, again, I think the Court's question directing her to try to supply an answer as to whether or not there was any direct evidence that could impute knowledge to either of these people is appropriate. I listened to her talk for several minutes, and the one word answer to your question would have been, no, there is no direct evidence. It's just assumption.

THE COURT: Well, I asked if there's any evidence from which it can be inferred, which may not necessarily be direct evidence. It may be circumstantial evidence.

MR. PROSPERE: I don't think there's any circumstantial evidence in which it could be inferred, and I think we were put on notice that this could be -- was an issue as far as the government was concerned, and I think the date this e-mail was sent is January '06. So if it had been going on earlier than that, certainly, we were not made aware of it. When we were made aware of it, we sent the e-mail and tried to make contact as quickly as we could. And, you know, things that go on over there culturally, we try to explain to them aren't acceptable over here, and we tried to communicate that in language a four-year-old should understand, and that's what we tried to do. That's all they could do at that point in time.

THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Cadeddu?

MS. CADEDDU: Yes, Your Honor. I would adopt
Mr. Prospere's argument, but I would also add that in this
case, with respect to Mr. Nnaji, we're even one iteration
further removed. So it's Ngozi Nnaji's relatives who are
making these threats. There isn't any direct evidence. There
is not even any circumstantial evidence that the government
could point to to show even Mrs. Nnaji's knowledge of that,
and there is certainly no evidence whatsoever that could take
that out, another iteration, to show that Mr. Emmanuel
Nnaji directed, induced, and procured that conduct.

I would add that the government makes what sounds like a

conspiracy argument, and I think that was in the response to the objection, but -- so that the defendants were somehow responsible on a conspiracy theory for the conduct of Francis -- I cannot say the name, the brother of -- Mrs. Nnaji's brother in Nigeria. The problem with that theory is that the conspiracy was alleged to have been completed. The allegations in the indictment are that it was over in February of 2006, and all of these alleged threats -- I mean, I'm assuming that the threats occurred like Your Honor is -- these threats occurred all after the end of the conspiracy date charged in the indictment.

So they can't be held accountable for a conspiracy theory because they were occurring outside the scope of the conspiracy, and there just isn't any direct or circumstantial evidence that would allow the Court to infer or impute knowledge that that was going on.

THE COURT: Do you have anything else you want to say, Ms. French?

MS. FRENCH: Yes. I would request that the Court adopt the factual statements in the government's response to both Defendant Ngozi Nnaji's objections to the presentence report as well as Emmanuel's that we filed, which set forth the facts according to the obstruction count, and just to highlight that the threats began the days of the victim escaping back in February 2006.

The only inference that can be drawn is that the threats were directly set in motion by the defendants, Judge, and they continued through -- and this is relevant conduct to the offense -- they continued through close to trial, and some of the recurring threats that are set forth in here involved reaching out to the Roman Catholic priest, who was the rescuer, attempting to intimidate him from coming to court directly before trial, and he has, the Court recalls, testified. So there's --

THE COURT: Where are you looking now?

MS. FRENCH: I am on the government's response to Defendant Ngozi Nnaji's objections to the presentence report. We filed a very similar response to Emmanuel Nnaji's objections, and we set forth --

THE COURT: Let me find what you're talking about.

MS. FRENCH: Certainly.

(Brief pause in proceedings)

THE COURT: Well, I'm afraid I can't find from a preponderance of the evidence that these defendants knew those threats were going to be made or did anything to encourage them to be made. I think an equal possibility -- you can equally infer that the members of the family and the family of Mrs. Nnaji simply took it upon themselves to try to discourage people from doing the things that were to the disadvantage of the defendant. So I'm going to sustain those objections. So

- I'll need some recalculations on that.
- I take it I've dealt with all the objections that
- 3 Ms. Nnaji has?

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

- 4 MR. PROSPERE: Yes, Judge.
- 5 THE COURT: And I have dealt with all the objections
- 6 that Mr. Nnaji has?
- 7 MS. CADEDDU: Yes, Your Honor.

any facts I found from the bench.

- THE COURT: Okay. There being no further objections
 to the presentence report as to either defendant, the Court
 adopts as the fact findings of the Court as to each of the
 defendants the facts set forth in the presentence report as to
 that defendant as modified or supplemented by any addendum to
 the presentence report, any facts stated in the addendum, and
 - And the Court adopts as the conclusions of the Court -the conclusions as to each defendant the conclusions set forth
 in that defendant's presentence report as modified or
 supplemented by any addendum as to that defendant and any
 facts I found from the bench as to that defendant.
- 20 (Brief pause in proceedings)
 - THE COURT: The Court concludes as to Ms. Nnaji as to the advisory guideline information that the Total Offense Level is 29; that the Criminal History Category is I; that the imprisonment range as to Count 1 is 60 months, which is the maximum -- statutory maximum; that the imprisonment range as

to Count 2 is 87 to 108 months; that the imprisonment range as to Count 3 is 87 to 108 months; that the imprisonment range as to Count 4 is 87 to 108 months; and that the imprisonment range as to Count 5 is 60, which is the statutory maximum.

And the imprisonment range as to Count 6 is 60; that the supervised release range is two to three years as to each count; and that the fine range is \$12,500 to \$1,500,000, and that a special assessment of \$600 -- that is \$100 per count per conviction -- is mandatory.

As to Defendant Emmanuel Nnaji, Mr. Nnaji, the Court finds -- or concludes that the total offense level is 34; that the Criminal History Category is I; that the imprisonment range is 151 to 188 months as to Count -- no. As to Count 1 -- let me back up on the imprisonment range.

The advisory imprisonment range as to Count 1 is 60 months, which is the statutory maximum as to Count 1. The advisory range as to Count 2, imprisonment range, is 151 to 188 months. The advisory imprisonment range as to Count 3 is 120 months, which is the statutory maximum, and the advisory imprisonment range as to Count 4 is 120 months, which is the statutory maximum. That the advisory imprisonment range as to Count 5 is 60 months with respect to the maximum, and the advisory imprisonment range as to Count 7 is 60 months, which is the statutory maximum, and that the supervised release range is two to three years per count. The fine range is

\$17,500 to \$1,500,000, and that a special assessment of \$600 is mandatory. That is \$100 per count per conviction.

Okay. Mr. Prospere, I'm going to let you -- well, we'll start with Ms. Cadeddu. You can make whatever statement you would like to make -- we'll come back to you, Mr. Prospere. We're going to start with Ms. Cadeddu.

MS. CADEDDU: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.

Your Honor, on behalf of Mr. Nnaji, we filed a sentencing memorandum in this case to give the Court a little more insight into --

THE COURT: I've read that. Thank you for submitting that.

MS. CADEDDU: Thank you, sir.

I think in this case the two most important factors, nonguideline-related factors, are Mr. Nnaji's lack of any criminal history and, also, his work history and the type of work he did. And I think that the Court can and should consider Emmanuel Nnaji's work with terminally and chronically ill patients, and the fact that he had a career change in order to be able to assist those folks.

The impetus for the career change for Mr. Nnaji was the fact that there's a number of family members suffering from chronic disease, including the deaths from diabetes-related complications of his mother and two sisters, as well as the drawn out illness of his late wife and the mother of his two

oldest children.

I received, actually, yesterday -- and I apologize for this, Your Honor. It came to my office yesterday, but it's a letter confirming Mr. Nnaji's employment with the Kind Heart Home Health System, and I would like to read that into the record for the Court because I think it gives some indication of the type of work he did.

Your Honor, my name is Ekwutosi Akintoye. I have lived in the Dallas area for ten years with my family. I have had the pleasure of knowing and working with Mr. Nnaji the past two years. During the years of our acquaintance, I have known Mr. Nnaji in many capacities. We have worked together as nurses with Kind Heart Home Health. Mr. Nnaji is a well-liked nurse in our company by other employees as well as patients.

Mr. Nnaji has shown good compassion towards all our patients, especially the ones with diabetes. Mr. Nnaji gave up a career as an engineer to go into nursing after losing both his mother and sister to diabetes. Mr. Nnaji dedicated his time to doing research on diabetes to give his patients options on ways to live and cope with the disease.

Mr. Nnaji is a good, compassionate, intelligent, and personable man. He's always prepared for his job and shows great compassion towards his career and his patients. He's always quick on his feet with sensible reactions to sometimes difficult situations that I've seen him in.

And that is signed by Ms. Akintoye.

I think, Your Honor, that the charges in this case, although very serious, are not the complete measure of a man.

Mr. Nnaji did work and did do good work with terminally and chronically ill people, and that work really did change the lives of those people. He did a lot of good for very, very sick patients, and I would ask that the Court consider that in sentencing him.

And other than my client's allocution, Your Honor, I believe that's going to be my presentation.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Nnaji, you have the right to make any statement or presentation you would like to make on the subject of mitigation, that is, the things you think the Court should take into account in determining what sentence to impose or on the subject of sentencing more generally.

MS. CADEDDU: Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes.

MS. CADEDDU: I apologize, Your Honor, but
Mr. Nnaji's accent is a little difficult. So he has his
statement prepared, and with the Court's permission, I would
like to give you a written copy of that so that you can follow
along.

THE COURT: Okay. Let me finish what I was saying.

MS. CADEDDU: I'm sorry, sir.

THE COURT: Mr. Nnaji, you have the right to make any

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

27 statement or presentation you would like to make on the subject of mitigation, that is, the things you think the Court should take into account in determining what sentence to impose or on the subject of sentencing more generally, and at this time, I'm going to invite you to do that. And as I understand it -- tell me what it is -- how does Mr. Nnaji wish to make his statement? MS. CADEDDU: He will read the statement, Your Honor, that he has prepared, but because his accent is a little difficult to follow, we've prepared a typewritten copy. THE COURT: Okay. Give the court reporter a copy of it. Thank you, Your Honor. MS. CADEDDU: And would the Court also like a copy of the letter I read into the record, or is that not necessary? THE COURT: That probably would be a good idea to give me a copy of it. MS. CADEDDU: Thank you, sir. THE WITNESS: Okay. You may proceed, Mr. Nnaji. DEFENDANT E. NNAJI: Thank you, Your Honor. Dear Honorable Judge McBryde: My court date is today, and I stand in the shadow of your justice and beg for your mercy and leniency. This is my first ever offense, and I promise it will be my very last. Please be merciful and lenient for God's sake and for my children's sake.

To begin with, my name is Emmanuel Nnaji, and I'm 50 years old. I was born and nurtured by my mother, Comfort Nnaji, who died in 2002 of diabetes complication, multiple strokes. She was 61 years old. My mother was separated from my father when I was only four months old, and my father died four years later of heart attack at the age of 55 years old. I am the only male and the last born of two children.

My two sisters, Theresa and Lucy, both died the same year in 1998 due to diabetes-related complications. My only remaining sister, Christine, sponsored me to U.S. and paid all my educational expenses, which resulted to bachelor of science in industrial engineering.

Currently, my sister, Christine, is dying from years of battling diabetes with neuropathy in both lower extremities.

I am the only remaining healthy one of the family. I'm also diabetic, diagnosed since 1997, managed with Metformin,

Glimepiride, and insulin.

My mother raised me as a Christian with a high moral standard, respectful to others, and to cherish Bible and education as my way out in life. I followed her advice.

Besides my degree in industrial engineering, I am also a graduate of Texas Women's University with bachelor of science in nursing with a business degree, both three points average. Your Honor, I went into nursing career for one main purpose, that is, to help and rescue the sick and suffering.

My first wife, Theresa Nnaji, died of Lupus in 1999.

Watching her life slipping away as I daily took care of her, including taking her to dialysis centers thrice weekly inspired me to go into a profession that will enable to help others in similar conditions. I am glad I did because I have put many smiles on many of my seriously ill patients and families.

Once again, Noble Judge, I stand at the shadow of your justice. Noble Judge, you are my only hope. Whatever sentence you pronounce today is a just punishment, but please be merciful and please be lenient. Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. I believe I indicated in my order of a few days ago that I tentatively concluded that a sentence above the top of the guideline range would be appropriate in this case as to this defendant, and I'm still -- maybe more so than ever -- that if it be a sentence within the guideline range as to this defendant, it would not be -- as to imprisonment, it would not be a large enough sentence to adequately address the defendant's behavior, criminal behavior.

As reflected by Paragraphs -- I think it's 131 and 132 of the addendum to the presentence report and, also, in the body, the defendant assaulted or raped the victim on at least two different occasions, but only one of those assaults was used to determine the advisory guideline computations. Had both of

them been considered, the combined advisory guideline level would have been higher, and the guideline range would have been significantly higher than it is now.

Based on the information the Court has, the Court finds that a sentence outside the advisory guideline range would be a reasonable sentence in this case and would reflect the nature and circumstances of the offense and the history and characteristics of the defendant and would adequately address the need to reflect the seriousness of the defendant's offenses and to promote respect for the law and to provide just punishment for the offenses. All is contemplated by 18, United States Code, Section 3553(a).

I've decided that a sentence of -- a combined sentence as to all of the counts of 240 months would be a sentence that would be a reasonable sentence that will take into account all the factors the Court should consider that would be divided amongst the different counts that would seem best to define them.

(Brief pause in proceedings)

THE COURT: Okay. I think we've figured out how to achieve what I think to be a reasonable sentence in this case. The Court orders and adjudges that the defendant be committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons to serve a term of imprisonment of 60 months as to Count 1 of the indictment -- okay, 60 months as to Count 1 of the indictment; 240 months as

to Count 2 of the indictment; 60 months as to Count 3 of the indictment; 60 months as to Count 4 of the indictment.

Let me back up. 60 months as to Count 1; 240 months as to Count 2; 120 months each as to Counts 3 and 4; and 60 months each as to Counts 5 and 6, all to run concurrently for an aggregate sentence of 240 months. So that's the sentence I'm imposing as the sentence of imprisonment.

Now, in addition, the Court is ordering that the defendant have the forfeiture that is applicable --

MS. FRENCH: Judge, the forfeiture we did not proceed on because the house had a net equity.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, we won't do that then.

The Court is ordering that the defendant make full restitution jointly and severally with his wife, Ngozi, and that restitution will be in the amount of \$305,957.60. Now, that restitution is payable immediately, but nonpayment will not be a violation of the defendant's conditions of supervised release so long as he pays, and that will be provided in those conditions.

All restitution payments shall be made by the defendant to the clerk of the Court here in Fort Worth for disbursement to the victims, Cecilia -- and I have a hard time pronouncing her last name. It's the victim. We all know the name of the victim. And those payments will be sent to her at the address that will be set forth in the judgment of conviction and

sentence.

I'm not ordering that the defendant pay a fine because I don't have any reason to think the defendant would have the resources to do that as well as make restitution.

I am ordering that the defendant serve a term of supervised release of three years as to each of the counts of conviction, 1 through 5 and 7, to run concurrently with each other. Now, the conditions of that supervised release will be the standard conditions that will be set forth in the judgment of conviction and sentence and the following additional conditions:

The defendant shall not commit another federal, state, or local crime. The defendant shall not possess illegal controlled substances. The defendant shall cooperate in the collection of DNA as directed by the probation officer and as authorized by the Justice For All Act of 2004.

Now, when the defendant's term of supervised release starts, any part of the restitution obligation, that is, the 305,957.60 remains unpaid, the defendant will make payments on that unpaid balance at the rate of at least \$200 a month, and the first of those payments is to be made no later than 60 days after his release from confinement and another should be made on the same day of each month thereafter until the full restitution amount is paid. Any unpaid balance of that restitution ordered by the judgment shall be paid in full 60

days prior to the termination of the defendant's term of supervised release, the conditions of the supervised release.

Going on with the conditions, the defendant shall refrain from incurring new credit charges or opening additional lines of credit without approval of the probation officer unless the probation officer makes the determination that the defendant is fully satisfying his restitution obligation.

I'm also ordering the defendant to pay a special assessment of \$600. That's payable immediately to the United States of America through the office of the United States Clerk, that is, \$100 per count of conviction.

Let's see. Mr. Nnaji, you have the right to appeal from the sentence I've imposed if you're dissatisfied with it.

That appeal would be to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit. You have the right to appeal in forma pauperis. That means without any cost to you if you qualify for it. You have the right to have the clerk of the Court file a notice of appeal for you, and the clerk will do that forthwith if you were to specifically request it.

You and your attorney have been given a form that outlines certain rights and obligations in reference to an appeal. If you haven't already done so, I want the two of you to review it to be sure you understand it, and once both of you are satisfied you understand it, I want both of you to sign and return it to the Court coordinator.

```
34
 1
          Has that been done?
 2
               MS. CADEDDU: It has, Your Honor.
 3
               THE COURT: Okay. The defendant is remanded to
 4
      custody of --
 5
               MS. CADEDDU: Your Honor? I'm sorry, Your Honor.
                                                                   Ιf
 6
      I may, I have a couple of housekeeping matters.
 7
          I need to object for record purposes to the
 8
      above-guideline sentence and object to the substantive and
 9
      procedural reasonableness grounds.
10
          And then I just wanted to ask -- Mr. Westfall asked me to
11
      ask the Court -- actually, I'm raising an objection --
12
               THE COURT: I'm sorry. I'm not understanding.
      can make whatever objections you want to make. I've made my
13
14
      rulings.
15
               MS. CADEDDU:
                             Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.
          And then I also would like to find -- I would like to ask
16
17
      the Court on behalf of Mr. Westfall for a finding of
      Mr. Nnaji's indigence based on the presentence report --
18
19
               THE COURT: Finding of what?
20
               MS. CADEDDU: Indigence, Your Honor, based on the
21
      presentence report.
22
               THE COURT: I'm not going to make that finding now.
23
      If he wants to qualify for that, do an appropriate motion with
24
      whatever documentation is required to support that motion.
25
                             I will convey that to Mr. Westfall.
               MS. CADEDDU:
```

made an additional copy that would be easier for you to follow

24

25

along.

THE COURT: Okay. If you want to hand it up, that might be helpful.

Ms. Nnaji, you have the right to make any statement or presentation you would like to make on the subject of mitigation, that is, the things you think the Court should take into account in determining what sentence to impose or on the subject of sentencing more generally, and at this time I'll invite you to do that is.

DEFENDANT N. NNAJI: Your Honor and respected Judge John McBryde.

Thank you, Your Honor, for giving me the opportunity to speak before you pass down your judgment. Please take into consideration the positive events in our lives. We have lived in this country for over 23 years. We have three beautiful young children. Our family have never, ever had any problem with anybody. Both my husband and I have lived productive life in this country.

My husband has gone to college to be a nurse at one of your finest university in Texas, and I have worked in the medical field for the last 12 years at the same hospital taking care of patients.

Your Honor, the most important things in this world are my three little children, Michael, nine years old with severe asthma, Precious, 10 years old with learning disability, and Joy, 12 years old. They are now living in a strange home.

They need their parents to be in their lives.

With all due respect to Your Honor, and in God we trust, I respectfully request your mercy and consideration in this matter. We have learned valuable lesson. Thank you for your time. May the joy of the Lord be your strength. May the Lord be precious to your soul, and may Angel Michael guide you always. Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. Do you have anything else?

MR. PROSPERE: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, I think in the case of

Ms. Nnaji, a sentence within the guideline range -- advisory

guideline range would be a reasonable sentence in this case.

I think a sentence at the top of it, though, collectively is

necessary for there to be a sentence adequate to address her

conduct and all of the factors the Court should consider under

18, United States Code, Section 3553(a).

So my plan is to impose a sentence that collectively produces a sentence of imprisonment of 108 months. Plus, there will be restitution of \$305,957.60 jointly and severally with her husband, and I think a term of supervised release of three years as to each of the Counts 1 through 6 would be appropriate, and a special assessment of \$600. That is \$100 per count of conviction. As I indicated, I think a sentence of that kind would be a reasonable sentence that would adequately and appropriately address all the factors the Court

should consider under 18, United States Code, Section 3553(a).

So the Court orders and adjudges that the defendant be committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons to serve a term of imprisonment of 180 months as to Counts -- each of Counts -- 108, 1-0-8. I think I misspoke, 108 months -- as to each of the Counts 2, 3, and 4, and to serve a term of imprisonment of 60 months as to each of the Counts 1, 5, and 6. All of those terms of imprisonment are to run concurrent, so that the aggregate term of imprisonment is 108 months.

I'm also ordering that the defendant make full restitution to the victim of her criminal conduct, and that will be in the amount of \$305,957.60. The restitution obligation, jointly and severally, with the restitution obligation of Emmanuel Nnaji is payable immediately -- her restitution obligation is payable immediately, but nonpayment will not be a violation of her conditions of supervised release so long as she pays as will be provided in those conditions. All restitution payments are to be made by the defendant to the clerk of the Court here in Fort Worth for disbursement to Cecilia Nwokonkwo -- I believe I finally got it fairly close -- at the address that will be set forth in the judgment of conviction and sentence.

I am not ordering the defendant to pay a fine because I don't have any reason to think she has or will have the

resources to do that in addition to making her restitution payments.

I'm also ordering that the defendant serve a term of supervised release of three years as to each of the Counts 1 through 6 to run concurrent with each other. And then pursuant to 18, United States Code, Section 3582(d), as a condition of supervised release, once a defendant has completed her sentence of imprisonment, she shall be surrendered by the Federal Bureau of Prisons to a duly authorized immigration official for deportation in accordance with the established procedure provided by the Immigration and Nationality Act. As a further condition of supervised release, if the defendant is ordered deported, she shall remain outside the United States.

Now, in the event the defendant is not deported immediately upon release from imprisonment or should she ever be within the United States during any portion of her term of supervised release, she shall comply with the standard conditions of supervised release that will be set forth in the judgment of conviction and sentence, and she will be made aware of those and shall comply with the following additional conditions:

She shall not possess illegal controlled substances. She shall not commit another federal, state, or local crime. She shall cooperate in the collection of DNA as directed by the

probation officer and as authorized by the Justice For All Act of 2004.

Now, when she starts her term of supervised release, any form of that restitution obligation of \$305,957.60 remains unpaid, she will make payments on that unpaid amount at the rate of at least \$200 per month, and the first of those payments is to be made no later than 60 days after her release from confinement, and another is to be made on the same day of each month thereafter until the full restitution amount is paid. Any unpaid balance of the restitution is to be paid as a condition of supervised release. If it's unpaid 60 days prior to the termination of the terms of supervised release, the full unpaid balance becomes due and payable at that time as a condition of supervised release.

Going on with the conditions, the defendant shall refrain from incurring new credit charges or opening additional lines of credit without the approval of the probation officer unless the probation officer makes a determination that the defendant has fully satisfied her restitution obligations. The Court further orders that the defendant pay a special assessment of \$600, that is, \$100 per count of conviction. That's payable immediately to the United States of America through the office of the United States Clerk.

Ms. Nnaji, you have the right to appeal from your conviction and the sentence I've imposed if you're

dissatisfied. That appeal would be to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit. You have the right to appeal in forma pauperis, and that would be without any cost to you if you qualify for it. You have the right to have the clerk of the Court file a notice of appeal for you, and the clerk will do that forthwith if you were to specifically request it.

You and your attorney have been given a form that outlines certain rights and obligations in reference to an appeal. If you haven't already done so, I want the two of you to review it, and once both of you are satisfied you understand it, I want both of you to sign it and return it to the Court coordinator.

Has that been done?

MR. PROSPERE: Yes, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay. The defendant is remanded to custody, and the attorneys are excused.

MR. PROSPERE: Judge, can I have one additional request? I know this isn't binding on the Bureau of Prisons, but if you could make a recommendation that she be assigned as close to Texas as possible, she would appreciate that.

THE COURT: I don't make those recommendations.

MR. PROSPERE: Thank you.

May I be excused, Your Honor?

THE COURT: You're excused.

```
42
                MR. FRANK: Your Honor, may we be excused?
 1
 2
                THE COURT: You're excused, yes.
           (End of proceedings, 10:40 a.m.)
 3
 4
 5
                                    -000-
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
                                 CERTIFICATE
21
           I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from
      the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter, and
22
      that the transcript was prepared by me and under my
      supervision.
23
      s/ Ana P. Warren
                                                 February 4, 2010
      Ana P. Warren, CSR #2302
24
                                                    Date
      U.S. District Court Reporter
25
                                    -000-
```